CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Vol. LXIV PITTSBURGH, PA., APRIL, 1930 No. 4

IN SOCIAL ROOM OF MONTGOMERY HALL

The Reverse of Human Rights

> **"As free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God."**
>
> **I Peter 2:16**

"HYPERION to a Satyr" was Hamlet's comment as he compared his father with his uncle who had murdered that father, married his mother and usurped his throne. And such would be a fair comparison of human rights and their reverse or their antipodes. Yet it is the commonest experience today to find people who are calling satyrs, Hyperion and zealously trying to thrust that perverted judgment onto others.

For instance, it certainly is a natural right to freely speak one's mind or publish what seems to one to be the truth or good. This right is the Hyperion of our liberties. But to publish and speak falsehood, to abuse or commit verbal assault by the use of uncalled for or false expletives, adjectives or expressions; these are the reverses of this human right and he who mistaking them for human rights calls them such, is mistaking a satyr for Hyperion.

It is the constitutional right of every citizen (not every resident of a country) to criticize the constitution, the laws or the government which supports them. This right carries all the glory and power of democracy in it. But the reverse is malicious propaganda, circulated with intent to inflame the people against the constitution, the law or the government in order to secure the opportunity to gratify beastly appetites, or diabolical tastes or dishonest gains.

It is a natural right, guaranteed by our Constitution, to eat and drink what suits one's taste. The satyr here is the assertion of a supposed right to destroy one's body or usefulness to the community in order to gratify a perverted taste. But the Constitution protects rights not their reverse.

It certainly is a natural right, guaranteed by our Constitution, of every individual to express beauty or life in picture, statue, literature or song. The negative of this right, its antipode, is to express degrading ugliness in the name of art. It matters not whether it be physical ugliness such as some recently produced statuary, cubic painting, the moral ugliness of dirty plays, pornographic magazines or perverted screen pictures. The Constitution guarantees only the right to force upon public attention beauty as art, not degrading ugliness or filth.

What American people need just now is the common sense to distinguish between Hyperion and a satyr; to cherish the obverse of human rights and repudiate the reverse. They need to realize that the Constitution was erected to guarantee natural human rights not their perversions or their antipodes.

To clamor for the reverse of these rights as though they were natural rights is as the Apostle said, "earthly, sensual and devilish." For it is an outstanding fact of history that it is these reverses; these antipodes of human rights that have ever been the murderers of the weak and innocent, the corrupters of virtue and the destroyers of liberties. To destroy them is but to preserve natural rights.

Shall the States Support the Constitution

AT the annual dinner of the Committee of One Thousand for law enforcement in New York City, Theodore Christianson, Governor of Minnesota, made a strong address on this subject asserting that "while the Eighteenth Amendment is a part of the supreme law of the land it is entitled to support and obedience from every citizen, every public official and even from every sovereign state."

His discussion of this subject is especially timely in view of the fact that Maryland has never enacted a state prohibitory law; that New York, Minnesota, Nevada and Wisconsin repealed theirs; that there is to be a referendum in Massachusetts and Rhode Island this fall on the question of the repeal of their prohibitory laws; and in view of the recent declarations of certain Congressmen and leaders of anti-prohibition organizations on this question. The address in full is published in "The Christian Herald." We are pleased to give our readers the following excerpts from it:

"The Constitution of the United States provides that the manufacture, sale or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territories subject to the jurisdiction thereof, for beverage purposes, is prohibited. This is an expression of a national policy, binding upon the nation, binding also upon the states. It was adopted by the people—the whole people—in the manner which "we the people" provided for amendment of the fundamental law. Whether wise or unwise, it represented the deliberate will of the people; it followed fifty years of experimentation in dealing with a problem.

* * * *

"The Eighteenth Amendment received more votes in the Congress, and was ratified by more states, by a greater preponderance of votes in the legislatures of those states, than any other constitutional amendment ever adopted in this country. It was an overwhelming expression of the will of the people.

"The people, having expressed the national policy, provided the means for carrying it into effect. So determined were they that their will should not be thwarted, that they empowered both the Federal Government and the states to enforce it. In this respect the Eighteenth Amendment is unique among all the articles and sections of the Constitution.

"The second section of the amendment provides:

"The Congress and the several states shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." Senator Borah, in an unusually lucid argument in which he shatters the sophistries of those who insist that this language imposes no duty upon the states, calls attention to the fact that the obligation laid upon the states in this section is no different and no less than that laid upon the Congress.

"Is it logical to suppose that the people, when they undertook the difficult task of amending their Constitution intended merely to enunciate a principle, without taking the measures which they considered necessary to put that principle into effect? Was it for the formulation of an abstraction that the people undertook this labor? Was it their intention to grant power to enforce a prohibition which they had written into the supreme law of the land, without expecting that that power should be used?

"Merely to ask these questions is to answer them. When the people of the United States declare a purpose in a constitutional provision that is not self-executing, and then clothe two agencies of government with power to execute that purpose, a legal obligation to use that power must be implied. And if it had been the purpose of the people to make the use of that power obligatory upon the Congress, but optional with the states, they would have found language with which to express that purpose.

"Before the Eighteenth Amendment was adopted, two courses were open to any state: to license the traffic in liquor or to prohibit it. The amendment deprived the states of the former alternative; it left them the latter. It is difficult to see on what theory the concurrent clause was needed to save to the states power with which they never parted. The concurrent power is not without meaning. It was not needed to express a reservation. It must therefore be interpreted as imposing an obligation.

"Let us test this conclusion by comparing the language of the executing clause of the Thirteenth Amendment with that of the Eighteenth. The Thirteenth is the only amendment besides the Eighteenth which contains a general prohibition binding upon the Federal Government, the states, and the people. It provides that 'neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.' Then follows Section 2: 'Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.'

"It will be noted that in the Thirteenth Amendment no concurrent power is given the states to prevent involuntary servitude within their borders. Did the specific grant of such power to the Congress, without a grant of concurrent jurisdiction to the states, deprive the states of the power they had previously had to prevent involuntary servitude within their borders? Has any constitutional lawyer ever assumed to give the Thirteenth Amendment an interpretation which would deprive the state courts of jurisdiction to give relief from involuntary servitude by writ of habeas corpus? Again, these questions suggest their own answer. A specific grant to the Congress did not deprive the states of power which they had formerly had. The Thirteenth Amendment added to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government without subtracting from the jurisdiction of the states. The Thirteenth Amendment made it the duty of the Congress to legislate, but left it optional with the states to do so.

"When the people adopted the Eighteenth Amendment, they sought to place upon the states an obligation with relation to prohibition of the liquor traffic, greater than that which the states had had with relation to prohibition of involuntary servitude. In fact, they wanted to make the obligation of the states under the Eighteenth Amendment as binding as that of the Congress under the Thirteenth. They sensed that for the successful enforcement of prohibition the facilities of both branches of our dual system of government would be needed; the facilities of the Federal branch to prevent importation, exportation, and interstate commerce in intoxicating liquor, those of the states to prevent its manufacture, sale and distribution within state boundaries. So while, in the Thirteenth Amendment, the people had left the states free to act, in the Eighteenth they placed the states

under the same obligation as the Congress.

* * * *

"It is true that the obligation of the states to support the Eighteenth Amendment is unenforceable. But so is the obligation of the Congress. There is no executive who can issue a command, no court which can make an order, compelling either the Congress or a state legislature to pass a law. But the fact that a duty is unenforceable makes it none the less a duty.

"A state can not be compelled to elect presidential electors, and the failure of all the states to do so would suspend the Federal Government. But the fact that the states can not be compelled to choose presidential electors does not relieve them of the responsibility to do so. In the case of Cohens vs. Virginia, a landmark of our constitutional law, one of the lawyers participating said: 'Whenever the states shall be determined to destroy the Federal Government, they will not find it necessary to act, and act in violation of the Constitution. They can quietly accomplish their purpose by not acting. Upon the state legislatures it depends to appoint senators and presidential electors or to provide for their election. Let them merely not act in these particulars, the executive department and part of the legislature cease to exist and the Federal Government then perishes by a sin of omission, not of commission.'

* * * *

"So the fact that there is no method by which the states can be compelled to exercise their concurrent power under the Eighteenth Amendment, in no way relieves them of the obligation to exercise it. The fact that no member of a state legislature can be compelled to vote for the enactment of laws to carry out the state's obligation, in no wise affects the duty of a state legislature to pass such laws. For every state legislator, upon assuming office, as a necessary prerequisite therefor, takes an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. That oath places upon the individual member an individual obligation. The sanction of that oath is the only sanction by which states can be made to carry out their obligation under the constitution. Daniel Webster, speaking upon this very point, said: 'The Constitution . . . lays its hand on the individual conscience and individual duty. It incapacitates any man to sit in the legislature of a state who shall not first have taken his solemn oath to support the Constitution of the United States. From the obligation of this oath no state power can discharge him. All the members of all the state legislatures are as religiously bound to support the Constitution of the United States as they are to support their own state constitutions. They are as solemnly sworn to support it as we ourselves are, who are members of Congress.'

"And Abraham Lincoln, putting the same thought in interrogatory form, asks: 'Can you, if you swear to support the Constitution and believe the Constitution establishes a right or imposes a duty, clear your oath without giving it support? Do you support the Constitution, if, knowing or believing there is a right established under it which needs specific legislation, you withhold that legislation?'

"Paraphrasing Lincoln's words, may we not ask members of the legislature in Maryland, in New York, in Wisconsin, in Montana, in Nevada: Can you, having sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, including every part thereof, clear your oath without giving support to that part of the Constitution which provides for prohibition? Do you support that part of the Constitution, if, knowing that there is a principle embodied in it which needs specific legislation to make it effective, you withhold that legislation?"

Prohibition Creed of 12,000,000 Women

IN presenting the case for the Eighteenth Amendment before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, two hours were given on the morning of March 12th to the representatives of thirty woman's organizations merged in the Woman's National Committee on Law Enforcement. These women were represented by Mrs. Henry W. Peabody, the national chairman of the organization, and each gave telling facts and arguments on behalf of the Eighteenth Amendment and its effective enforcement. The leaders of these thirty organizations drew up a fourteen point creed, to express the convictions of their organizations on this subject, which was perhaps the most telling thing presented at this session of the committee. We commend it to our readers and especially to the small coterie of women who previously appeared before the Committee on the wet side. Twelve million women are represented in organizations combined in the Woman's National Committee on Law Enforcement. Doubtless it is true that not every member would subscribe to the fourteen points of this creed, nevertheless, it represents the overwhelming sentiment of these thirty organizations.

We Believe

1—We believe in the Government of the United States, based on the Constitution, the supreme law of the land, according to Article VI of the Constitution: this Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof.....shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

2—We believe that prohibition of opium, alcohol, and other habit-making drugs, is a necessary protection in this machine age.

3—We believe the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution, voted by forty-six out of forty-eight States in the way prescribed, with a greater majority than any other amendment, is binding on all States.

4—We believe in the Volstead act, which has met the test of the Supreme Court, and limits alcoholic content to one-half of one percent. No other standard would be safe for children and those not innoculated with alcohol.

5—We believe that under the existing act, the buyer is equally guilty with the seller in illicit transactions in liquor.

6—We believe the economic gain resulting from the use of billions of dollars formerly spent in saloons, speakeasies and liquor for private use now used for better homes, clothing, food, washing and sweeping machines, automobiles, radio, life insurance and bank deposits justifies the law.

7—We believe the moral issue makes this law obligatory for the individual citizen and the duty of every church member, and that every church should teach respect for this law through its priests and ministers.

8—We believe in personal liberty for women and who have endured personal slavery through drunken husbands, and we recommend Paul's interpretation of liberty to certain eminent educators and legislators.

9—We believe in law observance for the protection of life, property, homes and human rights. Education in law observance, necessary and important, should be supplemented by discipline, the only edu-

(Continued on page 7, col. 3)

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Founded in 1867

Devoted to Christian Political and Social Science

Official Organ of

THE NATIONAL REFORM ASS'N,

An organization of Christian citizens founded in 1863

Published Monthly at the Association's Headquarters, 209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.

R. H. MARTIN, Editor-in-Chief

WM. PARSONS, Associate Editor

Rates, $1.00 the year, payable in advance, Entered as Second Class Matter, July 30, 1906 at Pittsburgh, Pa. under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Temperance—The Smoke Screen of the Wets

"We are against prohibition. It is a failure. We are against the saloon. Nobody wants it back. We are for temperance." So the oponents of prohibition are saying. Temperance has become almost a slogan with them.

Very well. Will they be so frank and kind as to tell us just what they mean by temperance and what they are doing to promote it? Do they mean total abstinence from the use of intoxicating drinks by moral suasion, or do they mean the moderate use of intoxicating liquors? If the former, what are they doing to teach that the beverage use of liquor is harmful, that liquor is poisonous, a habit-forming drug, and thus to persuade their fellow men and especially the youth, to let it severely alone? What have they ever done, what are they doing now or what are they planning to do in the future along this line? What are any of the organizations opposed to prohibition—the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, the Prohibition Reform Association, the Crusaders—doing to promote total abstinence?

Or if they mean by temperance the moderate use of intoxicating liquors, do they propose to teach their fellow men, especially our youth, that such use of intoxicating liquors is not harmful and may properly be indulged in and that only its excessive use is harmful? If so, how do they propose to encourage its moderate use and yet prevent its immoderate use?

Also if temperance means the moderate use of intoxicating liquors how do they propose that these liquors will be made and furnished to the people without bringing back the saloon or its equivalent?

The writer has tried to get this information recently in conversation with a number of those opposed both to prohibition and the saloon but who said they were for temperance. To date he has failed to get any satisfactory information from them. Among others, he tried the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House before which the wet and dry hearings were being conducted. In conversation with him at the close of one of the hearings he declared that while he was against prohibition he was also against the saloon but he was strongly for temperance. But when I pressed him for information as above, I did not get it. I asked him what I should teach my two children, my fourteen year old son and seven year old daughter—that they should abstain from all use of intoxicating liquors or that they should use them only in moderation. His reply was, "This is a matter for your own conscience."

Are not the opponents of prohibition using temperance merely as a smoke screen from behind which to fight prohibition? They should be made to come out from behind this smoke screen and fight in the open. Let us demand of them that they tell us what they mean by "temperance" and how they propose to promote it. On every hand let us force them into the open. Doubtless some of them are sincere but haven't thought the thing through and do not really know what they mean by "temperance."

But we surmise that the vast majority of them really want to bring liquor back—liquor with "a kick" and they are not very particular whether it comes back through the old time saloon, government control or any other way, so they get it back.

At Last

What many people on this side of our Northern Border have seen clearly for the last six years, McKenzie King and the Canadian government have finally come to see officially. That is, that the most dangerous element of their liquor policy of working with the rum-runners and the bootleggers and criminal gangs of the cities across the border, is that it is likely to endanger the historic friendly relations that have existed for more than a hundred years.

In presenting to parliament on March 14th a bill to forbid the issuance of clearance papers to exporters of whiskey to the United States, he declared "the chief reason of the Government is the averting of serious complications with the United States. The situation in respect to rum-running is a perilous one."

We are profoundly glad that the Canadian Government has seen this before Congress got around to the legislation on protecting the Border. It will not look so much like fortifying the Border when the reorganization bills pass.

Nations cannot persistently trespass across a border line without trouble any more than families can. Nothing is more likely to cause a national clash than for one nation to be compelled to shoot the citizens of another in the enforcement of its domestic laws, unless it is the knowledge that one nation is aiding and abetting the criminal class of the other.

Intoxicating Liquors and Traffic Accidents

In the Congressional Record there appeared recently a statement from the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union on "The Effect of Alcoholic Liquors on Traffic Accidents" from which we quote the following:

"Facts indicate that drunken drivers in this country have killed 15,000 and maimed or otherwise injured 300,000 to 500,000 people—many of them children.

"These facts must be considered in any discussion of prohibition repeal. At present the drinking driver is a menace: the doctrine of "personal liberty" makes him a selfish killer. Repeal prohibition and he will be a scourge. Canada repealed prohibition. In seven years whiskey sales trebled and with only a slight increase in cars, convictions for drunken driving increased 2,600 per cent.

"Ontario recognizing the mounting death toll from alcoholized drivers gives every motorist, with his license, a printed warning that many motor accidents are the result of liquor. This warning tells the motorist that it takes one-fifth of a second for a normal brain to send out the message which will enable the owner of that brain to put on brakes in an emergency.

"The same process takes from two-fifths of a second to three-fifths of a second when a man has taken the average drink. A car going 35 miles an hour will travel 20 feet in two-fifths of a second; and the government of Ontario warns drivers against liquor specifically on that point.

"Mounting alcoholic accidents in other countries where drinking is unrestricted warn the United States of America that every vote to liberalize the liquor laws here adds to the chance of killing or maiming some one—particularly a child.

Dr. W. V. Bingham, chairman of

Secretary Hoover's committee on causes of automobile acicdents, said:

'It is highly probable that liquor is a factor in a much greater proportion of cases than is officially recognized. Intoxication at times is difficult to prove in court."

The Modification Issue

Of course we all know that this modification of the Volstead Act is being urged as a tentative advance looking to the ultimate repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. Most of its advocates, if they would honestly declare what is in their minds would acknowledge that 2.75 beer would not satisfy their "robust taste" as Chairman Wickersham expressed it, but it would make a splendid cover for stronger stuff, it would make enforcement harder and nullification easier and give more ground for the complaint that conditions were intolerably bad and in this way ultimately disgust the American people so that they would favor going back to the saloon in some form. Just now the favorite is the South Carolina or a modification of the discarded Gothenburg plan, commonly known as the Canadian plan, which in Canada is the Government sale of distilled liquor and a wide-open sale of beer. The outstanding fact about this plan is that it has always failed as a restrictive measure and proven so profitable that it has always developed a degree of graft and corruption that is worse than that of the open saloon.

None of these advocates are quite honest enough to put their reasons so candidly. They prefer to cloak them with the guise of a patriotic desire to better enforce the Eighteenth Amendment and bring about better temperance conditions.

Representative Dyer of Missouri in an address to the Wickersham Commission stated his case thus: "I myself am convinced that it is the duty of Congress in making such a statutory declaration to place the limit as high as safely may be adopted, in order that the states in declaring what is intoxicating liquor by a mere fiat of law, shall avoid making the field of statutory prohibition wider than the constitution prohibition, which is only against intoxicating liquor."

He then cites the opinion of Dr. Hare of Jefferson College, Philadelphia, Pa., that "beer containing not to exceed 2.75 per cent of alcohol by weight is not intoxicating." Then he represents the slacker rebel states as justifying their actions by saying to the Federal government, "Since you are so unreasonable in your definition of an intoxicating liquor you must bear the entire burden of prohibition enforcement. We will not participate in the enforcement of a statutory lie against the citizens of our state. We will not penalize and imprison our citizens for the violation of a law that is unscientific and dishonest."

To all of which intelligent supporters of the prohibition law reply. There is nothing either unscientific or dishonest in this law. It proclaims its ultimate aim is to eliminate the drinking of alcohol. The limit of one half of one percent of alcoholic content was fixed by the liquor trade half a century since to protect themselves against near beer producers. It was found a safe limitation in the enforcement of the law and was adopted in the Volstead act and upheld as sound governmental policy by the Supreme Court. It is now simply welching hypocrisy to whine about that limit.

Beer of 2.75 percent alcoholic content is intoxicating in fact. While it may not make a seasoned drinker stagger it would make him unfit to drive an automobile. It would make a child drunk. I have seen young men get drunk on beer of that strength; not staggering drunk but hilariously foolish which is more dangerous in this mechanical age than more evident drunkenness.

We believe as Chairman Wickersham of the Commission which heard this address said a few days later "2.75 beer will not satisfy robust tastes." Grant this demand and immediately they would demand low grade whiskey or liquor of wine strength. This beer is not the ultimate demand. It is the old conditions they want. The late Chief Justice Taft in an opinion in the Samuels vs. McCurdy case decided in recent years said, "The object of all prohibition legislation is to restrict the use of alcohol as a beverage." Throw open the market to this low grade beer and it would greatly increase the consumption of alcohol as a beverage and so defeat the very end of all prohibition. It is a well known fact that before the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment, eight tenths of the alcohol consumed by the American people was in the form of beer.

But the chief objection to this concession to deprived appetites is that this liquor of low alcoholic content, while it does not satisfy "robust tastes" does keep alive the craving of the human body for alcohol. Its worst feature is that it cultivates that taste. The demand for alcohol in the human body is an artificial one, created by moderate use of small quantities regularly taken. That is precisely the most damning thing about liquor in the eyes of every true humanitarian.

All of this specious talk may please those with an incurable thirst, may deceive ignorant and thoughtless voters for a while and may for a time encourage violation of the law but it is destined ultimately to fail. For as Lowell puts it,

"Evil's triumphs are her endless loss
And sovereign virtue wins the soul
at last."

Winona Lake School of Theology Plans Big Summer Term

The Winona Lake School of Theology, at Winona Lake, Indiana has just announced its faculty and courses for the summer session to be held from July 9th to August 14th.

The faculty is a very remarkable one, including only men who are recognized as authorities in their departments, both as Authors and Educators. The faculty and courses are as follows:

Dr. J. A. Huffman, Dean, English and Greek New Testament.

Dr. A. T. Robertson, English New Testament.

Dr. John E. Kuizenga, Religious Education.

Dr. J. A. Faulkner, Church History.

Dr. A. T. Howard, Comparative Religions.

Dr. Leander S. Keyser, Christian Apologetics.

None of the courses offered this year have been given in the Institution for a number of years, making it possible for many students to attend and to pursue new courses.

The work is divided into two Semesters, the first one beginning on July 9th and closing on July 26th. The second Semester begins on July 29th, closing on August 14th. Students may register for either one or both Semesters.

Work is offered toward the degrees of Bachelor of Divinity, Master of Arts (in Theology) and Bachelor of Theology.

Winona Lake School of Theology is a High-Standard Interdenominational Divinity School, conducting summer sessions only. The work is thorough, evangelical and orthodox.

The President of the School is Mr. C. E. Sawtelle, of Cincinnati. Rev. William Edward Biederwolf, A.M., is the Director.

For a Prospectus containing full information, address Winona Lake School of Theology, Winona Lake, Indiana.

Association Activities

Mrs. Shepard and Mrs. Pritchard continue in the Anti-Mormon Campaign in Florida. Among the places where Mrs. Shepard has spoken recently are the following: Lakeland, Tampa, Winter Haven, Sarasota, Clearwater, Orlando and St. Petersburg. They expect soon to return north.

The pageant, "The Freedom of Liberty Bell," was presented in February to large audiences in Allentown and Lancaster, Pennsylvania. On the evening of March 11th, it was presented, under the auspices of the W.C.T.U. of Philadelphia, in the Bethlehem Presbyterian Church of that city of which Dr. W. L. McCormick is pastor. This large church was filled to capacity and reports are that those who were present were deeply impressed with the message of the pageant.

Miss Mary Curry of Winchester, Kansas began work with The National Reform Association the latter part of March. Her time will be devoted very largely to directing the presentation of the pageant, "The Freedom of Liberty Bell."

Miss Curry is a graduate of Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, has had several years teaching experience and has had great success in coaching high school debating teams. She has just returned from California where she has been taking post-graduate work in public speaking in the University of California and where she also directed the presentation of a number of pageants. A fuller statement concerning Miss Curry and her work will appear in the next issue of The Christian Statesman.

Dr. Fleming writes from Arkansas that notwithstanding rain and bad roads he is making good progress in the campaign for the Bible in the schools in Arkansas. He continues his work, interviewing editors of the religious and secular press, leaders and representatives of various groups throughout the state and speaking in churches and before Ministerial Association, Parents and Teachers Associations and other organizations and securing signatures to the petition to have the proposed required daily Bible reading legislation placed upon the ballot to be voted upon at the fall election. Among the places he has recently visited are Little Rock, Texarkana, Benton, Prescott, Russellville, Malvern, Fordyce, Dermott and El Dorado.

The National Reform Association will again have a prominent place on the Winona Lake Assembly program at Winona Lake, Indiana, this summer. Speakers of the Association will deliver the daily ten o'clock addresses from July 7th to August 2nd. This will be followed by the Christian Citizenship Conference, under the Association's auspices, of four days duration beginning August 4th and concluding August 7th. During this period the entire forenoon will be occupied by speakers representing The National Reform Association.

The speakers who will discuss the various phases of our work will all be authorities on the subjects they discuss giving the most up-to-date and valuable information obtainable.

Arrangements have just been completed with the Winona management by which the Association will close its Winona program with the presentation of its new pageant, "The Freedom of Liberty Bell," as one of the featured Winona evening entertainments of the season.

The article appearing in the last issue of The Christian Statesman entitled, "Lest We Forget," showing pre-prohibition conditions in Pittsburgh, awakened such a wide interest that it has been published in leaflet form. The demand for the 50,000 copies printed has been so great that this edition is about exhausted. These have been supplied to churches, Bible classes, W. C. T. Unions, young people's societies, various groups of a secular nature and to high schools. We filled one order for 5,000 copies for distribution among high school students. Ten thousand copies were furnished to one County Sabbath School Association whose officers are taking them in person to the 150 schools of the county.

No leaflet that our Association has put out recently has awakened such an interest and created such a wide demand. We should like to publish another edition of 50,000 copies at once. Here's an oportunity for our friends who are interested in this live subject to help in the wide distribution of this leaflet. Send us at once a contribution, $5.00, $10.00, $25.00, or more, and it will be used for this purpose.

Rev. R. A. Blair of Parnassus, Pennsylvania, has spoken a number of times recently for the National Reform Association an the subject, "Seeing the World Through the Eyes of My Dog." Many years ago Mr. Blair lost the sight of one eye due to climatic conditions in China where he was a missionary. Returning to this country he continued Christian work as a missionary and pastor. About three years ago he lost the sight of the other eye. Notwithstanding the handicap of total blindness he continues with success his work as a pastor.

About a year ago at the "American School of the Seeing Eye" at Nashville, Tennessee, he secured Dorothy, a German shepherd dog, and after a course of training with her, she became "his private secretary, guide and keeper." With her aid he is able to go anywhere in his own community and to travel to distant parts of the country in the service of his Divine Master.

Dorothy takes Mr. Blair to fill his National Reform engagements and appears with him on the platform. His address is given with the help of Dorothy and everywhere his audiences are deeply interested and profited. In his address Mr. Blair always presents some phase or phases of National Reform. Arrangements can be made for securing the lecture by Mr. Blair and Dorothy through our office, 604 Publication Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mrs. Shepard's Letter

So much is being written about the great Mormon temple to be erected in Independence, Missouri, by the "Church of Christ" and so many inquiries are coming to me about this temple that it seems necessary to explain about this division of the Mormon church that is making this effort.

When Joseph Smith was killed in 1844, by a mob at Carthage, Missouri, the church separated into several factions. Of these, there remain today only three: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, with headquarters in Salt Lake City; the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, with headquarters in Independence, Missouri; the Church of Christ or Hedrickites who have no headquarters. It is this latter and small group that is undertaking to carry out the prophecy of Joseph Smith, "that a temple would be built in Independence, Missouri, before one hundred years should elapse." The hundred years will be up on April 6th, and the Hedrickites, feel that they have had a vision and a call to fulfill, and that an effort must be made to get the foundation

laid before the sixth day of April, 1930.

This group is very poor, so they have called upon the Mormons of Utah to assist. This the Mormons of Utah have most indignantly refused to do; and the prophet of that church is warning his people not to be led astray or disturbed by those who are teaching a false doctrine, or who are building a temple in Jackson County, Missouri, saying that the only reason on earth for a church to call itself a reorganized church is to provide an organization for apostates and those who are willing to receive only a portion of the truth, and if any man really wants to know if Joseph Smith was a true prophet of God and who are Joseph's successors, and where the *truth is* he *can know.* "Do the will of God and you shall know the doctrine that Joseph Smith taught." At the present time it looks as if the "Church of Christ" will not succeed in their effort.

One of the university professors of Utah has said that young men and young women of the Mormon church should finish their education before going on a mission because when they return from their mission they are so set and determined, and so sure about the truth of the gospel that it is almost impossible to teach them the scientific truths, and they are very narrow minded. To this, the Mormon church heads have taken exception and are saying, "It is much better for young men and women to get a testimony of the gospel of Joseph Smith before completing their education so they can discern truth from error, for there is a great deal taught as truth by other churches that is not truth at all."

Another point that is being stressed by the Mormon leaders is in regard to the radio. The members are urged not to waste time listening in on all the radio programs, especially the sermons given by ministers who may teach them modernism. *Our church people are advised* to listen to the program broadcast by the Mormon Tabernacle choir, in which they give their hymns of theology; but Mormons must not "listen in" to our programs. One of their leaders remarked, "A yowling cat and a barking dog are beautiful compared to some things that come over the radio; and while formerly we gave time to the development of our children's talents, we now listen to the nonsense of other people's talents."

Reed Smoot has aroused considerable controversy over his attitude on the censorship of foreign books that are being sent into our country. He wants to hold a closed session of the Senate wherein he can read some of the salacious sentences and vile words he has found in these books. The People's Legislative Service has taken issue with Senator Smoot, and says that "expurgatory shears should begin their snip-snapping in brochures and other documents of the Mormon Church" especially referring to the writings of Brigham Young as found in the Congressional Library. Smoot met the suggestion on the indecency of Mormon literature with a shrug of his shoulders.

Our work goes on in Florida. We meet many who know of the Mormon activities and who are ready to meet their propaganda in an intelligent way. We know that God is leading his followers to understand the very dangerous and un-American teachings of this cancerous growth in our National life.

When you read this article, we may be in Philadelphia and that section again, to carry on the campaign begun in January.

Pray for the workers in the field.

A New Definition

A good American is one who obeys all the laws of the country except the Volstead Act, maintains all the institutions of the United States except the public schools, gives allegiance to all the Constitution except the Eighteenth Amendment and supports all its officers except the President.

It is needless to say who are the "good Americans" under this definition for it has been framed from the recent utterances of the Romanists. Father Delaney of Pittsburgh in a speech recently delivered at Williamsport, Pa., said, "Show me a good Catholic and I will show you a good American" and in the same speech he said "I never have and I never will believe in Prohibition." Father Ryan of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., says repeatedly that no man is under any moral obligation to observe the Volstead Act. The Papal Encyclical declares that the public schools are utterly unacceptable and the Roman Catholic organ "America" works itself into a fury quite often in denouncing the President, as do many other of their denominational papers.

It is a cause of profound gratitude to real Americans that there are no more of these "good Americans" than there are; and it is to be sincerely hoped that their proportion to the rest of the population will never increase.

Our definition of a "good American" is one who supports the Constitution in its entirety, observes every law upon the statute book in so far as he knows them, maintains every institution which is distinctively American and backs the present incumbent of the White House in his sincere endeavor to do an honest job in the presidency.

PROHIBITION CREED OF 12,000,000 WOMEN

(Continued from page 3)

cation for the lawless and criminal found largely among the upper classes and in the underworld.

10—We believe since "lawbreakers must not be lawmakers," law-making and enforcement departments of our government should demand that members, sworn to protect and defend the Constitution, either cease attacks on the Constitution leading to contempt for law, or relinquishing their office. And since the first duty of the government is to protect the people from violators of the law, we call for immediate and adequate action whatever the cost.

11—We believe, according to the Constitution, Article VI, that courts of justice should be relieved of prejudiced judges, often responsible for the failure of justice and the breaking down of law, through protecting the criminal rather than the public.

12—We believe there is no authority or precedent for submitting the Constitution, as a whole or in part, to a national referendum.

13—We believe that the press, which has been in the past and should be now a moral and civil asset, ought, without regard to the personal opinion of owner or editor, to give fair representation of the views of the law-abiding people and the government, rather than continue attacks on the law which will not be repealed and whose enforcement may be weakened by statements leading to crime and disorder.

14—We believe that in view of the disloyal and dangerous attitude of men and women of wealth and influence and the failure of officials, there should be law enforcement groups of citizens in town, county, State and nation organized to correct propaganda and safeguard law observance through regular channels, and that regular safety groups of men and women serve without compensation and be recognized and approved by the Government.

Horace Mann and Religion in Massachusetts Public Schools

To show the true attitude of Horace Mann toward the use of the Bible and the teaching of religion in the public schools is the purpose of a new book under the above title published by the Yale University Press, of which Raymond B. Culver, Ph.D., is the author. Horace Mann was secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education for a period of twelve years beginning with 1837. He, perhaps more than any other man, is responsible for the shaping of the public school system not only of Massachusetts but of the entire country. The annual reports of the Board of Education prepared by him for the period of his secretaryship are recognized as classics on education. His name has been very frequently associated with the secularizing of the public school system of our country. The writer of this book abundantly demonstrates that this commonly accepted view is wrong and does a great injustice to Mr. Mann. What Mr. Mann stood for was not the exclusion of the Bible and non-sectarian religious instruction, but of sectarian teaching, from the public schools.

At this time theological and sectarian controversies were raging in the New England states. Mr. Mann and also most of the religious leaders of both the orthodox and liberal churches were agreed that the introduction of sectarian teaching into the public schools would cause endless controversy and defeat the very purpose of the use of the Bible and religion in the schools, namely, the building of citizenship of an upright and moral character. His firm stand against sectarianism in the schools was misunderstood and misinterpreted by leaders in these sectarian controversies who charged him with excluding religion from the schools and making them godless. It is very evident from Mr. Mann's own frequent declaration from the reports of the Board of Education and from much other testimony which Dr. Culver introduces, that this charge was absolutely groundless.

Quoting Dr. Culver, "Horace Mann was opposed to sectarian doctrinalism in the schools but he repeatedly urged the teaching of religion common to all the Christian sects. He took a firm stand against the idea of a purely secular education and on one occasion said he was in favor of religious instruction 'to the extremest verge to which it can be carried without invading those rights of conscience which are established by the laws of God and guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the State.'"

Replying to the charge of one of his enemies, that he had ruled religion out of the schools Mr. Mann said, "You accuse me of being opposed to religion in our schools. I regard hostility to religion in our schools, as the greatest crime which I could commit against man or against God. Had I the power, I would sooner repeat the massacre of Herod, than I would keep back religion from the young."

Dr. Culver shows that during the period of Mr. Mann's secretaryship, there was a large increase in the use of the Bible in the public schools of Massachusetts. Just before the beginning of his secretaryship a survey of the schools of the state showed that the Bible was used in considerably less than one-half the schools. A similar survey made eight years later showed that the Bible was read in practically all the public schools of the state. Mr. Mann established normal schools in Massachusetts and the Bible was used in all those schools from the beginning. In the eighth annual report of the Board, which was prepared by Mr. Mann, a strong plea was made for the Bible and for religious instruction in all of the schools. The provisions of the law prohibiting sectarianism in the schools were cited and the school committees were reminded that jealousies would result from sectarian instruction or from the introduction of sectarian books; but the Bible was regarded as unsectarian and its use was urged. The Board believed that public opinion would guard against any wrong interpretation or abuses. Recognizing the value of the church, the Sunday school, and the home as agents of religious education, they nevertheless said that thousands of children would receive no instruction in religion unless they received it in common schools.

Dr. Culver has rendered a noteworthy contribution to the cause of religious education by correcting this misapprehension concerning Mr. Mann and showing that this great educator stood firmly for the use of the Bible and religious instruction in our public schools. We hope that this book will be read widely by our public school educators and by leaders of the Councils of Religious Education many of whom are undertaking to set up a program of weekday religious education on the basis that the Bible and religion have no rightful place in our public schools. The author's view on this subject evidently is in accordance with that of The Christian Statesman, that the Bible and non-sectarian religion have a rightful place in the curriculum of our public schools. We agree with him as to the responsibility of sectarian jealousies in excluding religion from our public schools as stated in the following closing paragraph of the book: "He (Mr. Mann) was not able to arrest the tide of secularization that has robbed our schools of religion. The secularized school of today is the result of just such jealousy on the part of Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, and the price we are paying in juvenile delinquency and adult crime is high."

The book is the result of a vast amount of research work, and it should be of great service in the movement to restore the Bible and non-sectarian religious instruction to their rightful place in the public schools of our country.

A Good Example

Ministrial Associations all over the country may well follow the example of the Atlanta, Ga., Association which recently adopted a strong declaration concerning the success and rectitude of Prohibition.

This declaration was thoughtful, well put together, covered a wide range of ideas, was dignified and courteous in its wording and carried a plain statement of the policy they proposed to follow in the future.

Its closing paragraph contained these words. "At the heart of the Christian conscience of this country there is a conviction, make up your mind to it, that the liquor traffic and the Christian gospel stand for two diverse and contradictory conceptions of personal and social life."

It will be just as well if all exploiters of men of every type from Henry Curran down to the pimp in the back alley, make up their minds to the fact that the Protestant conception of morality, drawn from the spirit of the Bible, is going to fight every moral battle to a finish in America. That every moral reactionary will be attacked on moral and Biblical grounds and given no peace until he retires from the field of human exploitation. From Father Ryan down to the Sabinite Crusaders they may as well get this idea into their heads. It will save them a lot of money, hard work and unpleasant bumps. Christian citizenship will not forever be bulldozed and flimflammed by selfish exploiters of the vices and weaknesses of mankind. Every year the Christian conscience is becoming more and more aggressive. May God grant that it will always be so.